

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/701,942	MEHTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHAILENDRA -. KUMAR	1621	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SHAILENDRA -. KUMAR. (3)_____.

(2) John White(Aude Gerstacher). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 08 July 2005.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Counsel authorized the Examiner's amendment to cancel claim 9..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036
TELEPHONE: (212) 278-0400

CHRISTOPHER C. DUNHAM
NORMAN H. ZIVIN
JOHN P. WHITE
WILLIAM E. PELTON
ROBERT D. KATZ
DONNA A. TOBIN
RICHARD B. MILNER
RICHARD F. JAWORSKI
PAUL TENG
GARY J. GERSHIK
KEITH J. BARKAUS
ARIAN A. BARYALAI
ASHTON J. DELAUNAY
CINDY YANG
BRIAN J. AMOS
JOSEPH B. GROSS
DANIEL N. SMITH
KATHARINE M. RICE

IVAN S. KAVRUKOV
PETER D. MURRAY
JAY H. MAJOL
ROBERT S.G. HOROWITZ
PETER J. PHILLIPS
WENDY E. MILLER
ROBERT T. MALDONADO
ERIC D. KIRSCH
ALAN J. MORRISON
JASON S. MARIN
MARIA V. MARUCCI
AUDE GERSPACHER
JEFFREY C. SHIEK
NARESH SRITHARAN
DAVID J. KETWICK
TONIA A. SAYOUR
LESLIE K. NGUYEN
NILAY D. PATEL

FACSIMILE: (212) 391-0525
(212) 391-0526
(212) 391-0630OF COUNSEL
DONALD S. DOWDEN
PEDRO C. FERNANDEZFOUNDED 1887
www.cooperdunham.com**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

NEW YORK STATE BAR ADMISSION PENDING

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING PAGES

TO : Examiner Kumar

COMPANY/FIRM : United States Patent and Trademark Office

FACSIMILE NO.: (571) 273-0640

FROM : John P. White, Esq./AG

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES, INCLUDING COVER PAGE: 4

DATE : July 8, 2005 TIME:

CLIENT/DOCKET: 0640/71389

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL BACK AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO (212) 278-0400

MESSAGE:

=====

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION IS INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S) NAMED ABOVE. THIS TRANSMISSION MAY BE AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION CONTAINING INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT A DESIGNATED RECIPIENT OR AN AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING IT TO A DESIGNATED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS DOCUMENT IN ERROR, AND THAT ANY REVIEW, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, OR IF UPON READING THIS DOCUMENT YOU HAVE REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THE DOCUMENT WAS INADVERTENTLY SENT TO YOU, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY COLLECT TELEPHONE CALL AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US BY MAIL. THANK YOU.

Docket No. 0640/71389/JPW/AG

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Satish Ramanlal Mehta et al.
Serial No. : 10/701,942 Examiner: S. Kumar
Filed : November 5, 2003 Group Art Unit: 1621
For : AN IMPROVED PROCESS FOR PRODUCING
ANTENOLOL OF HIGH OPTICAL PURITY

1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
July 8, 2005

BY FACSIMILE (571)273-0640
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn.: Examiner Kumar


SIR:

FACSIMILE CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
IN CONNECTION WITH THE ABOVE-IDENTIFIED APPLICATION

Date of Facsimile: July 8, 2005. I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date indicated above by facsimile and is addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Nicole Jordan
Printed Name:

Respectfully submitted,


John P. White, Esq.
Registration No. 28,678
Attorneys for Applicants
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Tel (212) 278-0400

Dkt. 0640/71389/JPW/AG

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Satish Ramanlal Mehta et al.
Serial No.: 10/701,942 Examiner: S. Kumar
Filed : November 5, 2003 Group Art Unit: 1621
For : AN IMPROVED PROCESS FOR PRODUCING ATENOLOL OF
HIGH OPTICAL PURITY

1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
July 8, 2005

BY FACSIMILE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMUNICATION CONFIRMING
EXAMINER'S TELEPHONE CONFERENCES

This Communication is submitted to confirm the July 7 and 8, 2005 telephone conferences between Examiner Kumar of the United States Patent and Trademark Office and Ms. Aude Gerspacher of the undersigned's office. On July 7, 2005, Examiner Kumar telephoned applicants' representative, and indicated that if pending claim 9 is canceled, he would allow the above-identified application. On July 8, 2005, applicants' representative telephoned Examiner Kumar to authorize the cancellation of pending claim 9 without disclaimer or prejudice to applicants' right to present a claim or claims to the product in the future, and confirm that the subject application, so amended, is deemed allowable. Based on these telephone conferences, applicants understand that a Notice of Allowance in connection with this application will be issued shortly by the U.S. Patent Office.

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided below.

Applicants: Satish Ramanlal Mehta et al.
Serial No.: 10/701,942
Filed : November 5, 2003
Page 2

No fee is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this Communication. However, if any fee is required, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of any such fee to Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

Respectfully submitted,



John P. White, Esq.
Registration No. 26,678
Attorneys for Applicants
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 278-0400